on the spot within 15 days. This system has worked fairly well. There is no doubt that in some cases the ryots do not or cannot make their representations within the prescribed time. Even in such instances, a provision exists for revision by superior officers at the spot, besides the general power of revision in all cases vested in Government. Some time has to be fixed within which objection-petitions should be presented at the spot. Without such a provision, settlement work which has to pass through several stages will be unduly prolonged and this is not desirable.

37. Registry of trees standing on porambokes such as tank-bunds and river-banks in the names of the growers themselves.

Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai (*Tovala*) said that formerly all tank-bunds and river-banks belonged to the people and it was at the present settlement that they were treated as poramboke. This was hard and he prayed that provision might be made for registering the trees in the names of the growers themselves.

Mr. V. Sankaranarayana Iyer B. A., B. L. (*Agastisvaram*) represented that in the ayacut of 1012 the bunds of tanks and banks of rivers had been registered in the names of private individuals and that it was only now that Government treated them as poramboke. He learnt that orders had been issued to lease them out at kudipattom rates and this virtually meant that Government were taking away from the ryots the lands which once belonged to them. Even if such lands could not be registered in the names of the holders, they should be permitted to take the manure leaves from the trees standing on them. This was even now allowed in some cases and the member prayed that the concession might be extended to all as a general rule.

Mr. Kanakku Mathevan Mathevan (*Nedumangad*) represented that tank-bunds were put up for the use of the ryots and not of the Government and that they should not therefore be treated as poramboke.

Reply.—The question whether these tank-bunds and river-banks are private or Government property is in every case a question of fact. Originally some of them might have been entered as registered holdings in the Ayacut, but in cases where they are actually found to be poramboke they have to be reserved as such. The existing rules sufficiently provide for the registry of trees on such lands on kuthagapattom without limit of time. It is to the advantage of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ryots that every tank should have bunds and every channel should have banks. These have to be recorded as poramboke to prevent encroachments on them which are now found to be frequent.

In regard to the rate, it is fixed in reference to the trees standing on such porambokes. Each case will be disposed of on its merits and all possible relief afforded.

38. Desirability of registering bunds on the sides of paddy fields and the trees standing on them in the names of the owners of adjacent lands.

Mr. R. Narayana Iyer (*Kottarakara*) said that the owners of wet lands generally put up bunds on the sides of their fields and planted trees on them. The Settlement department treated such bunds as poramboke and registered them in the names of whomsoever they might choose. He requested that this mode of indiscriminate registry might be stopped and the lands and trees registered in the names of their owners.

Mr. Kanakku Parameswaran Krishnan (*Kottarakara*) also spoke on the same subject.

Reply.—This statement does not correspond with the existing practice and rules. But if any concrete instance is brought to notice, it will receive attention.

39. Introduction of some measure to avoid loss to the ryots consequent upon the filing of numerous civil suits from the hasty decisions of settlement supervisors.

Mr. N. Govinda Pillai (*Kunnattur*) said that temporary supervisors were deputed from different departments for settlement work and their decisions were both hasty and unsatisfactory. The poor ryots could not seek redress in civil courts as the cost was prohibitive. The member requested that some measures might be devised to afford relief in this matter.

Reply.—The general principles of the new scheme of settlement were discussed last year. Government did not then consider that any interference was called for, nor does the present statement appear to be correct as a general rule. Individual cases of error may be rectified on the spot. If the party is not satisfied and goes to court, it cannot be helped. Correctness of decision will be enforced as far as possible and efficient supervision exercised.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly